9077. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Marlborough Market, a Corporation. Collateral of \$25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 13939. I. S. No. 16630-r.)

On February 4, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against the Marlborough Market, a corporation, Washington, D. C., alleging that on February 27, 1920, the said company did offer for sale and sell at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained added water.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality, and had been substituted in part for oysters, which the article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, oyster solids, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

On February 4, 1921, the defendant company having failed to enter an appearance, the \$25 collateral that had been deposited by said company to insure its appearance was declared forfeited by the court.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

So78. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Old Dutch Market, Inc., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 13940. I. S. Nos. 16623-r, 16627-r, 16657-r, 17420-r.)

On February 4, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against the Old Dutch Market, Inc., a corporation, having a place of business at Washington, D. C., alleging that on February 4, 6, 26, and 27, 1920, respectively, the said company did offer for sale and sell at the District of Columbia, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, quantities of oysters which were adulterated.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained added water.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality, and had been substituted in part for oysters, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, oyster solids, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

On February 4, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

E. D. Ball, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

9079. Adulteration of candy. U. S. * * * v. 850 Pounds * * * of Candy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14119. I. S. No. 8694-t, S. No. E-3036.)

On December 23, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Supreme Court of the District aforesaid, holding a district court, a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 850 pounds, more or less, of candy, at Washington, D. C., alleging that the article had been offered for sale and sold in the District of Columbia by the Washington Salvage Co., Washington, D. C., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.